

1. The drawings were received on 2/20/08. These drawings are objected to. They were no properly labeled as replacement drawings. Descriptive matter is not proper in drawings. The description is required to be in the description in the specification.
- 2.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

Replacement Drawing Sheets

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement sheets which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments section, or remarks, section of the amendment paper. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). A replacement sheet must include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and within the top margin.

Annotated Drawing Sheets

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheet(s) must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheet" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings.

Timing of Corrections

Art Unit: 3781

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The reference numerals 4,5,6 and 7 do not appear in the description.

Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant is advised that the amendment submitted 2/24/09 to the specification was not entered because it didn't comply with 37 CFR 1.121 (see previous notice of Non Compliance)

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 5, 8 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 5 and 8 each recites the limitation "said out surface" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Note that this is not the previous version of the claims as applicant indicates.

7. Moreover the claim for "a personally selected item ..." in claims 7 and 8 appears to be a double inclusion of that now claimed in claim 3.

8. Similarly the limitation added to claim 16 "luggage comprising a luggage case having an interior, a top and a front, a flap formed in said front ..." is a double inclusion of that set forth in claim 10. In claims 17 and 18 it isn't clear how a first adhesive surface of the sheet is adhered to the outer surface if the first adhesive surface bears an image including a photograph, school colors or a flag as now claimed in amended claim 16. Applicant appears to have the surfaces reversed from that established in claim 16. Claim 19 now appears to claim a double inclusion of claim 16 as it has been amended.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-6 and 8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miles et al '959 in view of Connell '502 and Defreitas '376, all of record. Miles teaches applicant's concept of providing a cover on the external surface of a wheel of wheel luggage. To have provided the cover with adhesive on both surfaces of the sheet with covers to protect the adhesive would have been obvious in view of such teaching by Connell in column 3. To have formed the picture as a photograph would have been obvious in view of such teaching by Defreitas. Official Notice is taken of the fact that the examiner has used a strap with school colors to identify luggage since 2002. Application to the wheels would have been most obvious

10. Claim 10 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen '732, of record.

Chen teaches applicant's concept of providing a flap on the upper front of wheel luggage to provide ease of access into the interior. Note the zipper on the flap as shown in Figure 2A.

11. Claim 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference as applied to claim 16 below, and further in view of Grebenstein '920, of record.

To have merely provided the flap with an external zippered pocket for holding additional items in the manner of Grebenstein at 15 would have been most obvious.

12. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Miles et al '959, Connell '502 and Defreitas '376 in the manner applied to claims 3-6 above.

13. Applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.

14. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9 and 11-15 have been canceled.

15. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon

skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

16. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Art Unit: 3781

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. () _____ - _____ on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

/Sue A. Weaver/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit
3781
sue.weaver@uspto.gov